Smith's Report

No. 172 *Challenging the Holocaust Taboo Since 1990* May 2010

The Student Newspaper and the Question of Taboo at Cal State U Fullerton

by Bradley R. Smith

This is the text of the talk I gave at California State University, Fullerton, on 06 May 2010. Following this text is an account of the issues we faced with the Campus Project during March, April and May and how going on campus at CSU Fullerton came about. If you have been following Smith's Report *for any time at all, you will be familiar with what I say here. If you were a student at Cal State Fullerton on 06 May, however, it is most likely that you will not have been familiar with any of it.*

The Student Newspaper and the Question of Taboo

Good afternoon. I'm glad you're here.

This afternoon I will suggest that the American professorial class, as a class, plays an integral role in supporting a taboo against a free exchange of ideas regarding the Holocaust Question. And that this taboo places the student journalist, and in fact the entire student body, in an impossible predicament with regard to the issue of intellectual freedom on the university campus.

That in so doing the professorial class compromises the ideal of a free exchange of ideas throughout the university, and in the student press particularly. Any student journalist who goes against this taboo places her entire career in jeopardy, not merely at the newspaper where she works, not merely in the university where she studies, but for her entire public life.

I will demonstrate how this taboo against a free exchange of ideas functions, particularly in the student press, using the vocabulary of the professoriate itself as it appears in student newspapers.

The student papers I will reference here are:

The *Daily Titan* here at CSU Fullerton.

The *Badger Herald,* at U Wisconsin-Madison.

The *Daily Northwestern,* Northwestern U, twice.

The *Harvard Crimson* was a good story a couple months back, but I'll have to let it go for now.

The *Daily Titan* at Cal State University Fullerton

Last month the *Daily Titan* ran a banner ad in its online edition submitted by my office titled "The Irrational Vocabulary of the American Professorial Class …"

By clicking on the banner the reader was taken to one of the pages on my Web site where she would find the text to a talk I gave at the International Holocaust Conference in Tehran, Iran, in December 2006.

The title of my talk in Tehran was: "The Irrational Vocabulary of the American Professorial Class with Regard to the Holocaust Question." The entire text of the talk, some 4,500 words, is there to be read.

Our ad ran in the *Daily Titan* from 05 April to 16 April when, although we had a contract to run

for 30 days, it was unilaterally removed.

Five days later, on 21 April, the *Daily Titan* published a column signed by the *Titan* editorial board, titled "Free Speech vs. Moral Obligation." There were a number of minor errors of fact in the piece, which I pointed out in a letter to the *Titan*. No need to go over them here.

The column signed by the editorial board was very carefully written. With regard to the text of the Tehran talk, the *Titan* says "Smith makes a number of claims in this speech, most of which are questions of what society has come to accept as fact in reference to the Holocaust." That's true.

The *Titan* does not quote or question one specific claim in the Tehran talk. There are some 2,000 professors at CSU Fullerton. The *Titan* has not printed one communication by one of them addressing one claim that I made in the Tehran talk.

The *Titan* notes that when you purposely break a taboo there are consequences and that it is commonplace in society that you are punished when you do that. In the end, the Editorial Board decided to not risk being punished. In a sense, I don't blame them. It is my guess that there is not one professor at CSU Fullerton who would defend a student journalist who attempted to write about the "other side" of the orthodox Holocaust story.

The *Titan* Board wrote: "If any of our readers saw the ad before it was removed and were offended by its content, we sincerely apologize, as it was not our intent to upset or anger any member of our community."

The editorial board does not quote anything in the text of the Tehran talk that might offend, upset, or anger any *Titan* reader. The board wrote: "We ultimately decided to remove the ad from our website because we believed we have a responsibility to the sensibilities and sense of decency of our readers."

When I spoke in Tehran there were Muslims in the audience from all over the world. Not one appeared to be offended, upset, or angry. Not one told me that anything in my talk was indecent or that it offended her sensibilities. What is the *Titan* talking about then? Who is the *Titan* talk about?

Really?

The *Titan* wrote: "The story of what happened at the Badger Herald [at U Wisconsin-Madison] is particularly instructive."

And indeed it is.

What happened at the Badger Herald demonstrates how the taboo functions that protects the Holocaust question from a free exchange of ideas. What happened at U Wisconsin would cause any *Daily Titan* journalist to pause. To wonder what would happen to her if she were to address the question objectively.

The *Badger Herald* at University of Wisconsin-Madison.

The ad we ran in the online edition of the *Badger Herald* at U Wisconsin-Madison was not the ad we ran in the *Daily Titan*. The *Badger Herald* ad was a tiny text link with only seven words. In a tiny font it read:

The Holocaust Question:
THE POWER OF TABOO.

That's it. Seven words and a link to our CODOH homepage.

The ad started running on 19 February, and on 25 February the editor of the *Badger Herald*, Jason Smathers, wrote a column titled "UW Community Strong Enough to Face Ad, Reject it." In this one column Smathers wrote: "The seven-word ad masks itself as an attempt to challenge conventional wisdom." Well, yes. Does it make sense for journalists to not challenge conventional wisdom if the facts of conventional wisdom regarding any particular set of circumstances appear, to some, to need challenging?

There was a time in America when conventional wisdom argued that Black Americans did not deserve the full rights of American citizenship. In a number of American states it was taboo to suggest that they did. In the end, that conventional wisdom was challenged and shown, shall we say, to not be very wise.

But here is what I want to get to. Let's take a look at the vocabulary Mr. Smathers uses in his column discussing the seven-word text link that leads to my homepage. And let's speculate on where he picked up this vocabulary.

Mr. Smathers writes that what I assert is "wildly and obviously false, foolish, reprehensible, painful and wrong, without truth, a wholesale rejection of truth, lies, an affront to objective truths, absolute incompetence, completely vacuous in nature, and rotten goods."

What I want to emphasize here is that Mr. Smathers does not address one argument made on our Website. He does not display any familiarity with one revisionist text, with one revisionist author, or with one revisionist argument. He only condemns the messenger. Where did the editor of that student newspaper pick up this vocabulary, this approach to a historical question? An approach that focuses on attack-

ing the messenger while ignoring the message?

Well, let's turn to the Chancellor of U Wisconsin-Madison, Ms. Biddy Martin, the campus where Mr. Smathers edits the *Badger Herald*.

In the few days since the *Badger* editorial was published, essentially apologizing for running our text link, the story grew from the appearance of a seven-word text link in a student newspaper to academic round tables condemning revisionist arguments, to charges of anti-Semitism by the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith and Hillel: the Jewish Student organization, to Wisconsin media state-wide.

Someone has appeared in their midst saying that there are questions that need to be asked about the orthodox Holocaust story. There is not one instance where one of these folk addresses the content of one revisionist text.

And then on 02 March the *Badger Herald* published a column by UW chancellor Biddy Martin. Her article is titled: "Truth and scholarship greatest tools in combating falsehood."

Chancellor Martin writes that what I write is "offensive," "a serious breach of the academic principles," "an effort to deny hundreds of millions of planned deaths," "shrill ideological and partisan claims," "lies and distortion," "reckless claims," "encourages a sense of outrage …" and so on.

Chancellor Martin does not address anything I have written. She does not address one revisionist text on our Website. If you do not like the message you bury it, you snuff it out, you suppress it, you censor it, you kill it. And you do all you can to destroy the messenger. Content is to be evaded. The messenger is to be destroyed.

Mr. Smathers, the editor of the *Badger Herald*, has absorbed the vocabulary of the professorial class at the university where he is studying. That of the professors who teach there. Why would the student editor of the *Badger Herald* not think that it is right and correct to use a defamatory vocabulary to attack the revisionist messenger while making certain that no specific revisionist text is mentioned, much less examined? Can we really expect a student journalist to forward the ideal of intellectual freedom on a campus where her own professors do not forward it? In fact, betray it?

I don't think so. The *Badger Herald* student editorial staff is overwhelmed by what is effectively the academic and media taboo against an open debate on the Holocaust question.

Chancellor Martin suggests I deny the Holocaust. I do not. I find that there are questions that remain to be asked about the Holocaust, and that there is a taboo against asking them. The irrational support of intellectual taboo on a university campus goes against the first principles of the university and of education itself.

Chancellor Martin writes that the facts about Nazi genocide have been established by the historical record. If this is so, doesn't it follow that any question that might be asked about the Holocaust by a student journalist, or asked by any student, could be answered to her satisfaction? Why not? Do university Chancellors actually need taboo to protect them from questions they find dangerous?

Chancellor Martin writes: "Denials of the Holocaust are offensive to everyone who elevates fact over ideology." Her concern with repeating the newspeak term "denial" demonstrates that she is arguing from an ideological perspective against those who plead only for a free exchange of ideas.

Chancellor Martin writes that "the facts" of the Holocaust are established and to question these established facts is "outrageous." What is outrageous is the Chancellors' dependence on authority and taboo to protect these established facts. No one at the *Badger Herald* feels safe to ask questions about any of this.

Chancellor Martin writes that she hopes *Badger* readers will combat lies and distortion with education. I would caution all student journalists, including those here at Cal State Fullerton, to beware the Holocaust ideologue who, with an outrageous disregard for the university ideal of a free exchange of ideas, will argue not for education, but for the subjugation of intellect.

Chancellor Martin represents a professorial class that has chosen ideology over education—there can be no education when no questions are allowed. She represents a professorial class that with regard to the Holocaust question expresses an insatiable appetite to control the thought of others.

Chancellor Martin is willing to ignore First Principles with regard to the current view of the Holocaust story. Ask only approved questions. Read only approved books. Give only approved answers. If you do anything else, you have broken the established taboo against questioning one historical event.

The American professorial class, represented here by Chancellor Biddy Martin, is in the grip of a cultural ideology, one which she appears to support absolutely, that dictates that no one can question the orthodox Jewish Holocaust sto-

ry without risking her career, her income, her good name. Without risking everything. Only authority, used with real gravity and the power to punish, can forward such a taboo.

That's the primary characteristic of the ideologue—the need to be in absolute control. Have absolute authority. And therein lies the real value of the taboo against free inquiry that is so clearly supported at so many American campuses, and defended everywhere by the professorial class.

It is my view that it is right and good to question authority, to question vigorously precisely those matters that authority tells you are unquestionable.

A fundraiser for the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum

I thought that after the editorials, letters to the editor, academic round tables, public demonstrations, print press and television coverage that took place state-wide in Wisconsin, the story at U Wisconsin was over.

I'm an innocent guy.

On 13 March I found that Sara J. Bloomfield, the director of the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum in Washington D.C., had taken up the U Wisconsin *Badger Herald* story to use it as a fundraiser for the Museum.

In the fundraiser Ms. Bloomfield writes about a "deplorable ad campaign currently running on the Web site of a major U.S. university student newspaper (she means the U Wisconsin-Madison). Paid for by a Holocaust denial group, the ad links to a hate-filled Web site (she means CODOH.com) designed to manipulate young minds."

She writes: "These days it's easy and cheap to propagate hate: the ad cost a mere $75 to run for 30 days. We cannot afford to be silent in the face of such offensive and dangerous rhetoric. Please help the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum continue to disseminate the truth about the Holocaust by making a generous gift today**."**

She writes: "While we can't stop haters, we can minimize their impact. But we need your help."

Ms. Bloomfield writes: "Spreading hate and lies is cheap: it cost only $75 for one Holocaust denial group to reach tens of thousands of students. Today, I ask you to take a stand against those who spread such venom by making a $75 gift of your own. While *their* $75 goes to promoting anti-Semitism and hate, ***your* $75** will combat denial by preserving and presenting the truth."

So here we have the same irrational vocabulary I've been talking about being used to raise money. "Deplorable," "hate-filled," "lies," "venom," "anti-Semitism," "designed to manipulate young minds," "to propagate hate," "offensive, dangerous rhetoric": combat denial, **send money!**

No text of mine or of CODOH.com is referenced. No venom. No hate. No nothing. Only an irrational condemnation of unexamined charges and the pitch for funds.

To repeat: a seven-word text link produces leads to:

Student editorials (there were more than one) attacking Smith personally.

Faculty roundtables and demonstrations attacking Smith personally.

Statewide media repeating attacks on Smith personally.

An editorial by the university chancellor attacking Smith personally.

The Director of the USHMM attacking Smith personally

Nothing I have written, nothing that we have published on CODOH.com is examined, or even referenced.

The *Daily Northwestern* at Northwestern University

Here I will turn to the *Daily Northwestern*, the student newspaper at Northwestern University in Evanston, Illinois. To demonstrate how things can change over time, I will relate two stories from *Daily Northwestern.*

I published my first full-page revisionist essay-advertisement in the *Daily Northwestern* on 04 April 1991. It was titled "The Holocaust: How Much is False?" The text was some 2,700 words.

For the first time on an American university campus, core revisionist arguments challenging the orthodox Holocaust story were outlined in a university publication. Every observation we made reflected a commonplace revisionist argument. No student had ever read such arguments, and no professor had ever discussed them publicly. In the ad we informed our readers that:

It cannot be demonstrated that 6 million Jews were "exterminated" during WWII.

Or that homicidal gas chambers existed in any camp in Europe which was under German control.

It cannot be demonstrated that the awful scenes of the dead and emaciated inmates captured on newsreel footage at Dachau, Bu-

Continued on page 10

The Unexploded Ordnance of Wartime Propaganda

By Jett Rucker

During wars, people are encouraged, even forced, to kill other people—individuals about whom the killers know nothing specific, not even their names, much less their particular crimes or reprehensible intentions. It is declared, by persons of authority in such matters, that doing this is one's duty—a noble, if distasteful, undertaking. This being the case, the practice of inventing and spreading lies about those people it is (every)one's duty to kill seems comparatively mild and, indeed, it is engaged in even by some people who might refuse to engage in the actual killing. Just as war is "diplomacy by other means," propaganda is war by other means.

In peacetime, by contrast, it is not supposed to be virtuous or dutiful to kill masses of otherwise unidentified people simply on the basis of where they live, the language they speak, or their nationality. And one isn't supposed to create or tell false stories about such groups. Of course, there are those, including governments, that sneak about doing just these things during nominal peacetime, but that is merely the covert conduct of war where the attacker hopes that the targets won't realize they are at war until too late.

The subject here, rather, is what might be called the lethal "residues" of the very special (trampled) ethics of wartime hostility—the activities that are officially proscribed in peacetime, and are mandatory demonstrations of patriotism in war. Both the dropping of bombs and the publication of calumny implant the body of human society with deposits of latent poison that can explode decades after the cessation of hostilities, spreading fear, death and—yes, recrudescent war—against innocents who weren't even born when the original war was fought.

Like unexploded ordnance, these caches of fear and hatred can lie dormant until either they are inadvertently stumbled upon, or some brave discoverer undertakes to defuse them, or some brutal fresh combatant commandeers them and redeploys them against new targets in a new war that may or may not be a reprise of the original. All this is true of the ordnance of a thousand mostly forgotten wars, lying in millions of dormant booby traps throughout the lands and waters frequented by unsuspecting humans. And it is equally true of the atrocities of a thousand wartimes, lying in millions of books, articles, diaries, legends, and mendacious imaginings now migrating to NEW books, periodicals, and Web sites.

The inadvertent and unintended discovery and detonation of unexploded ordnance—and unexploded lies—is itself a tragic echo of the malign depredations of war, but this article concerns the other two situations: the one where the effort is made to discover and defuse the hazard, and the other where the opportunity is seized and exploited to spread future mayhem and panic. Both activities can lead to explosions—consciously risked but unintended in the first case, but sought-for and deliberately applied in the second. Ironically, those seeking only to defuse sources of future hatred and mistrust are often subjected, upon discovery by parties of the second sort, to accusations of seeking to forward hatred and mistrust.

Such is the situation with inquiry into historical fact that moves into terrain hitherto commanded by the exigencies of wartime propaganda and the propaganda spread by victors after each and every war. The unexploded ordnance lies everywhere—in every crevice that can be plumbed by minds that are mad with fear, inflamed by hatred, brutalized by loss, weary with grief, engorged by greed and the lust for power.

The threat posed by wartime propaganda, however, is far more persistent, and therefore far more lethal, than that of mines, bombs, and artillery shells. The legacy of propaganda can be, and is, *fought over* in ways that don't equally apply to a bomb found in the basement of an apartment building fifty years after the bomb was dropped.

If an inquirer employing traditional standards of historiography happens upon a matter emphatically attested to by postwar propaganda—say, the purported killing of

six million European Jews by the German government during the Second World War—and undertakes to confirm or refute the point with (otherwise) accepted evidentiary methods, the matter blows up in his face. There are no historians of note who undertake such inquiries, for the simple reason that all who have are no longer historians (e.g., David Irving), at least so far as those that the organized profession deigns to recognize. This and related unexploded ordnance have been appropriated, and are being deployed, by forces in possession of the "high ground" of academia, publishing, and thus public opinion.

This gives rise to a catch-22 of "self-verifying marginalization" in which the work of inquirers into the actual history of the Holocaust and other tales supporting today's dominant power elites is rejected by "respectable" publishing houses, periodicals, and Web sites. They can publish their findings only with "specialty" publishers, of which the Web site on which this article is offered is almost certain to be an example. As a consequence of this marginalization, the very agents who enforced this marginalization are then able to discredit our hapless inquirers as "self-published," and "obscure." "Self-published" is, indeed, the *samizdat* of publishing in the Western world of the Twenty-first Century, though it does not as yet enjoy the respect accorded the clandestine publications that brought down the Soviet Union.

The situation, then, imparts a very genuine, if ironic, heroism to those few who devote themselves to the perverse, career-destroying line of inquiry that intrudes upon the fiercely defended armamentarium of the army covertly waging a war in the present day on the noxious residue, the malevolent mythology, produced seventy years ago to motivate and justify the torrent of mines, bombs, and shells poured down on the people of Germany (and Japan) in their homes and places of work. The prize, control of the narrative of who did what to whom in Europe from 1935 to 1945 and why, is today pernicious contraband in the hands of a racist, imperialist regime in the Middle East that perpetrates upon the indigenous populations there an ethnic cleansing and occasional "massacre" that bear an eerie, and profoundly reminiscent, similarity to the practices of which they accuse the German regime that provided their genesis.

An "Amazing" Letter from Treblinka

By Thomas Kues

In 2005, historians Eric Johnson and Karl-Heinz Reuband published a volume entitled *What We Knew: Terror, Mass Murder and Everyday Life in Nazi Germany* (John Murray, London). The book contains a number of recent interviews with Germans as well as Jews of German nationality deported to ghettos and "death camps". One of the latter is Ernst Levin, born in Breslau (present Wroclaw) in 1925. In January 1943 he was deported to Auschwitz, where he worked in the Buna-Werke in Monowitz (Auschwitz III). The most interesting part of the Levin interview, however, does not concern Mr. Levin himself, but a friend of his in Breslau (pp. 74-75):

"Just about four weeks before I went on my transport, there was one transport before mine and a friend of mine named Helmut went on that transport. That transport wound up in Treblinka. In a place near Treblinka, there was also a contingent of Germans working, one of whom we had known. Helmut wrote a letter and gave it to this man and said: 'Send it to my Ernst.' I got this letter. I never knew who sent it or how they got it out. He told me in this letter that he was near Treblinka and '*hier ist ein Lager, wo die Menschen chemisch behandelt warden.*' [here is a camp where the people are being treated with chemicals.] It is amazing that even at that time he wouldn't say that they were gassed. Isn't that amazing? I was thinking, 'what the heck does he mean?' I guess he eventually was gassed. He certainly didn't survive."

Amazing indeed! What is especially striking about the letter's reported content is the wording

"chemisch behandelt" ("chemically treated"). According to official historiography, the alleged mass killings at Treblinka were carried out using engine exhaust gas. Obviously no layman would connect exhaust gas with chemicals. The early war-time and post-war claims about killings with steam and vacuum on the other hand are impossible to connect with the concept of "chemical treatment". From Levin's statement it is clear that his friend Helmut did not write that the deportees died from the "chemical treatment"—otherwise Levin would have easily drawn the conclusion that the phrase referred to mass killings using some chemical agent!

Since the reported message from the Breslau Jew Helmut is only fragmentary, it is as good as impossible to draw any conclusions from it. It is possible, though, that "*chemisch behandelt*" is a reference to a part of a delousing procedure. The *Ostarbeiter* (Eastern European deported to Germany for work) Galina K., who worked in a transit camp near Hannover during the war, has testified that she and the other worker prisoners "smeared heads, armpits and genitalia [of the *Ostarbeiter* deportees] with a chemical solution" (Janet Anschutz, Irmtraud Heike, "Medizinische Versorgung von Zwangsarbeitern in Hannover: Forschung und Zeitzeugenberichte zum Gesundheitswesen", in: Gunter Siedburger, Andreas Frewer, *Zwangsarbeit und Gesundheitswesen im Zweiten Weltkrieg. Einsatz und Versorgung in Norddeutschland*, Georg Olms Verlag, Hildesheim, Zürich, New York 2006, p. 52). It is well worth noting in this context that an Israeli-Polish archeological team during a survey at the site of the former Sobibór "extermination camp", and more precisely at the site of the "death camp proper" or Lager III, discovered—besides a complete lack of remains of the alleged homicidal gas chambers—"larger jars, some (…) produced in the Netherlands, [which] could contain disinfectants" (Gilead et al., "Excavating Nazi Extermination Centres", in: *Present Pasts*, Vol. 1, 2009, p. 30).

That Helmut managed to hand over the letter to the German acquaintance who worked "near Treblinka" appears more than a little curious in the light of the orthodox Treblinka narrative. Oddly enough Levin seems to contradict himself when he states that "I never knew who sent it or how they got it out". Did he not himself just say that Helmut gave the letter to the unknown German man? From the testimony of Israel Cymlich we know, however, that prisoner details from Treblinka II frequently worked outside of the camp (Israel Cymlich & Oskar Strawczynski, *Escaping Hell in Treblinka*, Yad Vashem, New York/Jerusalem 2007, pp. 45-46). It is therefore entirely possible that Helmut and the German man met at a common place of work.

Soccer matches between guards and inmates (at Belzec, cf. testimony of W. Dubois), photographs taken within camp limits and developed outside of the camp by Polish civilians, local villagers employed near the "gas chambers" (cf. Tregenza on Belzec), films taken of "fake" weddings (at Sobibór, cf. testimony of K. Wewryk), prisoners returning voluntarily after a mass escape (at Sobibór, cf. testimonies of E. Wullbrandt and F. Suchomel), postcards sent by prisoners ("Helmut" at Treblinka)... the deeper one digs in connection with the Aktion Reinhardt "extermination camps", the more dumbfounding details one finds, details which reveal that the SS personnel stationed there did not have much to hide. After all, why bother with security measures when one had only a top secret extermination program to run!

"Holocaust" Debate in Hungary.

In March 2010 the Hungarian parliament adopted an anti-revisionist law making it illegal to dispute the orthodox version of the "holocaust". At the same time, Hungarian nationalist and revisionist Otto Perge suggested a debate on the topic. One of the country's most prominent "holocaust" scholars, Dr. Laszlo Karsai, accepted the challenge.

Having learned this, our old friend Jürgen Graf contacted Mr. Perge and offered his assistance, which Perge accepted. Graf then sent Perge 17 questions for his opponent, in English. Dr. Perge translated them into Hungarian and had them published on a web site supportive of the nationalist Jobbik party (http://kuruc.info). Having read them, Dr. Karsai told Perge that he did not intend to answer these questions.

However Dr. Karsai attempted to refute the revisionist point of view by making 15 statements, which he sent to Otto Perge, who has a sound knowledge of the sub-

ject but is not a specialist. Perge translated these statements into English and forwarded them to Graf. As some of Karsai's arguments are often adduced by revisionism's adversaries, Graf took great care to answer them in detail. Beginning on 24 April, Graf's answers to the arguments were published on the kuruc.info web site, in both Hungarian and English.

One of Hungary's best known historians, Dr. Krisztian Ungvary, offered Dr. Karsai his help and prepared eight questions for Otto Perge. As we go to press, Perge is translating the eight questions into English. Graf intends to answer them when received, and the Hungarian translation will then be published on the above-mentioned web site.

Graf's detailed account of these developments is being continually posted on his web site (http://juergen-graf.vho.org), in English and German.

As for the Jobbik party, Jews showed consternation in April when it gained about 12% of the 386 seats in parliamentary elections, the *Jerusalem Post* bewailing that "the ruling Socialist Party was dethroned, falling from 190 to just 59 seats while its coalition partner, the Liberal Party, which enjoyed strong Jewish support, lost its parliamentary presence altogether."

Let us hope that the new Hungarian anti-revisionist law is stillborn.

Can't Stop the Signal

by John Weir

Twenty years ago the politics of the world was in transition. The Berlin Wall was history, but German reunification had not been formalized. The economies of Eastern Europe were exhausted and the men to become known as oligarchs began buying up the formerly state-owned mineral and production assets of the collapsing communist states.

At that time the gatekeepers of the major avenues of mass communication were still in control. For revisionists, particularly those researching the fate of Europe's Jews under Nazi occupation from 1940 to 1945, the gates remained closed.

Archives in Eastern Europe, however, were being opened at the same time some of those in Central Europe were being closed to those researchers who lacked the right intentions.

The official death toll for Auschwitz had been reduced from 4 million people to around 1.5 million people by the Polish government in 1990. The original Soviet number included at least 1.5 million gentiles. The Polish government had resurrected nearly all of them.

Around that same time the Polish state also issued a report countering the Leuchter report. Though it confirmed the chemical tests done by an independent lab for Leuchter, the authors of the report decided the absence of Prussian blue in the samples tested proved nothing.

Soon thereafter, the Holocaust revisionists were pretty excited by a major reply to the perceived growing threat to orthodoxy they represented in the form of a book published by the Beate Klarsfeld Foundation. Jean-Claude Pressac's *Auschwitz: Technique and Operation of the Gas Chambers* had been published the year before. Pressac's book was a massive reply to the 30-page report of Fred Leuchter, which was a product of the Zundel trial in Canada a couple years before. Revisionists, it seemed, were no longer being ignored, or simply denounced, by orthodoxy. At least some of them were actually replying to what the revisionists were doing. The "Battleship Auschwitz," David Irving declared, had been scuttled by its infighting crew.

During the early '90s more revisionist reports were published confirming Leuchter's: An Austrian engineer, Walter Luftl, published a study debunking the gas chamber story and Germar Rudolf, a chemistry student at the Max Planck Institute, made a field trip to Auschwitz. His study confirmed Leuchter's findings.

By then, however, any dialogue between revisionists and orthodox, if such ever existed, was coming to an end. "In a general way," wrote Robert Faurisson in 1992, "I am pessimistic for the future of revisionists. But I am optimistic for the

future of revisionism: the work initiated by Paul Rassinier and crowned by the brilliant work of the American Arthur Robert Butz, *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century*, has known, thanks to Ernst Zündel, such a great expansion that no obstacle will be able to impede its course."

Kabbala student and a defender of orthodoxy, Professor Deborah Lipstadt published a book which essentially attributed evil motives to the revisionists and declared there is nothing to debate. Debate with revisionists is immoral. The new "rules of engagement" were established along with a new pejorative, "denier." Blocked from the gatekeepers, revisionists were quick to embrace the new technology for mass communication. The Internet and the advent of the World Wide Web changed the game entirely. The orthodox remain in control of old established institutions, but the walls are coming down. It was no longer necessary to get permission from the establishment to communicate with the masses.

Small circulation revisionist paper newsletters and magazines sent through the government snail mail have since been largely replaced with email communication and internationally accessible web sites. People can anonymously view revisionist articles and books. They can participate in forum discussions dealing with Holocaust trivia.

After initial attempts to block revisionists, such as Ernst Zündel, from using the Web failed, revisionist web sites began to proliferate. More and more revisionist information became available to people with computers connected to the Internet. As this occurred, the numbers of people getting connected exploded.

With the fall of the Iron Curtain, many documents dealing with the fate of Europe's Jews during World War II became available to researchers, and with that revisionists had more material to post to the Internet. Entire books are now available at no cost. They are free for download.

While the orthodox continued to make pilgrimages to the sites of Nazi labor camps, revisionists continued making field trips. The Auschwitz myth having been largely destroyed for anyone with enough initiative to become familiar with the revisionist literature, Richard Krege of Australia led a team to the Treblinka site. Using ground penetrating equipment, his team spent about a week searching for the location of the grave that at one time held hundreds of thousands of corpses. He reported he was unable to locate it. In the subsequent decade, it remains unlocated.

The orthodox have not taken this lying down. Dr. Faurisson's pessimism has proven correct. Whenever possible, revisionists have been dragged to venues where the "orthodox" are still in control. The courts and countries with laws protecting establishment dogma have put men who have committed no crimes into prisons for months, and years. Hans Schmidt, David Irving, Ernst Zündel, Dr Fredrick Töben, Germar Rudolf, and many others have been imprisoned in Europe, or Australia, for what they have said or written about the Holocaust during the last twenty years.

On the other hand, Faurisson's optimism has also been validated. No obstacle has been able to impede revisionism's course. Attempts to discredit revisionist research have been disappointing to its critics. Michael Shermer's 2000 book titled *Denying History: Who Says the Holocaust Never Happened and Why Do They Say It?* was superficial and unconvincing. As the title indicates, what those who say the Holocaust Never Happened actually say was not the topic of the book. The focus of book was who said it and their imagined evil motives.

With the Internet hole in the wall to mass communication, few revisionists, except Bradley Smith, even knock at the gate any longer. Knowing their treatment will be both harsh and irrational, unless the idea is to get the establishment upset, there is no point because the guards at the gate control little that is important to most revisionists. Revisionists now can and do self-publish articles, books, magazines, videos. These are available to most of the world via computer and the World Wide Web.

Last year Austrian economist and libertarian writer Gary North, in a column titled "Wikipedia and Google Will Bring Down Establishments All Over the World," wrote the following:

THE GATEKEEPERS' DILEMMA

> The gatekeepers can no longer control the flow of information. This has never happened in man's history. Gatekeepers still control the gates. But the walls have holes in them. These holes are widening.
>
> The gatekeepers control accreditation. They no longer control content except where it is very expensive to do primary research, such as nuclear physics. In the social sciences and humanities, it's just about over.

When I think "Establishment," my mind goes back to Rocky III. Mr. T's character tells Apollo Creed, "You're going down."

If you find something worth posting, post it. Call this "post-it notes." It beats armed revolution every time.

Make a free online YouTube or Blip.tv course out of your favorite controversial topic. Imitate Salman Khan: www.KhanAcademy.org. (Note: Khan graduated from MIT and the Harvard Business School.) He did it with these low-cost or free tools.

In short, if you find something evil that wobbles, push it.

Revisionists? Push!

Cal State Fullerton—Continued from page 4

chenwald and Bergen-Belsen—were the victims of intentional killing and intentional starvation.

It cannot be demonstrated that there are "tons" of captured German documents which prove the mass murder of Jews and others in homicidal gas chambers.

Or, as was claimed during war crimes trials, that Jews were cooked to make soap from their fat, or skinned to make lampshades from their hides.

It cannot be demonstrated that during the war the Red Cross, the Pope, humanitarian agencies, and prominent figures such as Roosevelt, Truman, Churchill, and Eisenhower all knew about "gas chambers" but kept quiet about them.

There it was. For the whole world to see. Nothing in those claims was original with me. They were all standard Holocaust revisionist arguments.

One week after our advertisement appeared in the *Daily Northwestern*, the student paper printed a 1,250-word letter from a professor of history and German on that campus. His name was Peter Hayes. He taught a course on Holocaust studies. I believe he still does. If anyone at Northwestern University was capable of disputing any claim made in our ad, Professor Hayes was that man.

This was a milestone for revisionism. The first time a real Holocaust revisionist text was printed in any university publication that I am aware of, and the first time that a professional scholar had the opportunity to demonstrate in public where at least one serious revisionist assertion was wrong and why it was wrong.

What did Professor Hayes do?

Professor Hayes ignored the published text of the ad and in one modest column in a student newspaper, the *Daily Northwestern*, charged me with "manipulation," "deception," "distortion," "ignorance," "intimidation," "nastiness," "dishonesty," "duplicity," "maliciousness," "tastelessness," "browbeating" academics like himself, "conspiracy mongering," "implausibilities" and "disinformation."

That was almost 20 years ago. Twenty years.

If, in 1991, Professor Hayes were to have proven to be an exception to the rule, his performance in the *Daily Northwestern* would not have been noteworthy. But that was not to be the case. What Professor Hayes demonstrated 20 years ago would prove to be the rule in the years following, not an exception to it.

Throughout the 1990s I ran essay-advertisements in student newspapers at hundreds of university and college campuses from one end of America to the other. Typically, each academic year or two I would write a new text. The response by the professorial class to these texts, year after year, was substantially the same. The texts would be ignored, while their author would be attacked with an irrational vocabulary of insult, hysteria, and innuendo. All through the 90s. It was remarkable.

The few exceptions to this rule were typically written by student editors. None argued that any particular revisionist argument was sound, none had been introduced to revisionist texts by their professors, but a good number of student editors did argue that the Holocaust question should be open to a free exchange of ideas, just like any other historical question. And it is worthy of note, in this context, that a solid percentage of those student editors who did stand for intellectual freedom on the Holocaust question, were students whose families were Jewish.

But now, to demonstrate how the professorial class at Northwestern has changed its perceptions of the last 20 years, I will address a story that appeared in the *Daily*

Northwestern in 2006. The story begins on 01 February 2006, 20 years after the shameful behavior of Professor Hayes. This story took place in the wake of the international uproar that arose in response to Iranian President Ahmadinejad's contention that the Holocaust is a "myth": that's his word.

The Iranian news agency Mehr interviewed Professor Butz and published the interview.

Briefly, this is what Professor Butz told the Iranian news agency Mehr:

"The alleged slaughter of millions of Jews by the Germans during World War II did not happen.

"The extermination allegation is properly termed a hoax, that is to say, a deliberately contrived falsehood.

"The hoax had a Zionist provenance and motivation.

"That in 1976, when The Hoax was first published, there were two developments that he did not foresee:

"Western countries undertook a massive repression of revisionism, including imprisonment for thought crimes of those who questioned the story.

"That the cognizance of the Holocaust in the West had been transformed into what can only be interpreted as religious in nature."

Then Professor Butz congratulated President Ahmadinejad on becoming the first head of state to speak out clearly on these issues, and regretted only that it was not a Western head of state. He wrote that there could be "no question that I endorse President Ahmadinejad's remarks in those respects." He was careful to say, "in those respects." He was not talking about anything else.

The Mehr interview with Professor Butz was distributed all over the world. All of us who work with this material were delighted. Now, certainly, the light of day would break through the obscurity to which Butz had been relegated at Northwestern.

Holocaust revisionist Professor Arthur R. Butz and the President of Iran. A dynamic duo.

Certainly there would be some professors in American academia who would now take a sober look at *The Hoax of the 20th Century* and revisionist arguments generally.

Alas! I am a hopeless romantic.

On 06 February, five days after the Mehr interview was distributed, the president of Northwestern University, Henry S. Bienen, issued a statement about it. President Bienen said nothing about any specific assertion of fact in anything Professor Butz has ever written, in the Mehr interview, on his Web site, or in *The Hoax of the 20th Century*.

President Bienen, making a deliberate decision to not communicate, wrote only that Professor Butz's opinions are "reprehensible" and "a contemptible insult to all decent and feeling people."

On 09 February the Religion Department at Northwestern University published a letter in the *Daily Northwestern* in which it did not address any assertion of fact in anything Professor Butz has ever written. Rather, the Religion Department charged Professor Butz with "fraud," "lying," "abuse," "hateful speech," "faking data," and "moral and intellectual failure."

Ten days following, sixty-one faculty members of Northwestern University's Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science—Professor Butz's own department—published a letter denouncing him. Not one of these professional scholars addressed the text of anything Professor Butz has ever written.

His department colleagues wrote that they "utterly disavowed" and "condemned" Professor Butz. They charged that he is an "extreme embarrassment" to his colleagues, that his views are an "affront to their humanity" and beneath their "standards as scholars." They "repudiated" him and urged him "to leave" the Department.

With regard to "change" then: during the last 20 years there has been no change whatever within the professoriate at Northwestern University with regard to the public examination of revisionist texts. No revisionist text is to be examined in the light of day. The individual who writes such a text is to be condemned.

More distressing, and I want to say an even more disgusting fact, is that while there are some 1,800 professors employed at Northwestern University, not one stood up in public to argue that Professor Butz's *The Hoax of the 20th Century* should be examined before it is condemned, that at least one paper should address his book, after more than 30 years of condemnation, and that that address should be published in a peer-reviewed journal where Professor Butz would have the right to reply.

Not a chance. We're talking about the American professorial class here. The American professorial class is in moral crisis over this issue and does not have enough character to see it for what it is.

To sum up then:

The American professorial class exploits an irrational vocabulary to respond to revisionist arguments

questioning the orthodox Holocaust story.

The decision of the American professorial class to exploit this irrational vocabulary is a deliberate decision to avoid communication.

The purpose in deliberately choosing to not communicate as scholars to either students or colleagues is to, effectively, nurture and protect an academic environment in which it is taboo to question the "unique monstrosity" of the Germans during World War II.

To question the "unique monstrosity" of the Germans would necessarily suggest that the history of the 20th century would have to be rewritten, and the nature of the role of the United States in that war and in world affairs since would have to be reevaluated.

The professorial class has created a moral dilemma for itself which, out of a secret guilt, a secret shame, it is unable to address openly. If it were to address the orthodox Holocaust story without fervor, without passion, and allow others to address it in the same light, it might be found—it just might—that the unique monstrosity of the Germans is not what we have insisted it was, that it can no longer be used by the U.S. Government to morally justify the invasion of Palestine by European Jews, that it cannot be used to morally justify the ensuing U.S. alliance with Israel, and that it cannot be used to morally justify the endless hypocrisy that is associated with both and which has been a catastrophe for Americans.

Now — I want to say that I am willing to be convinced that I am wrong about anything I say here.

Thank you.

And the talk was over.

I asked for questions. The usual. You give a talk, you follow it with a Q&A. But something happened then that I have never encountered before.

The audience in the classroom at that moment was maybe 25 persons, a mix of students and professors. When I asked if there were any questions, they sat there without speaking, without moving, looking at me. If some had gotten up and left without speaking, that would have been normal. If a couple hands had gone up to ask a question, that would have been normal. But no one moved. No one said anything. They sat silently, without moving, just looking at me. It was as if they were posing for a Norman Rockwell painting. Utter stillness, utter quiet. Looking at me. It lasted for several very long moments. Then one person broke the ice by getting up and leaving silently. Then others followed suit. But it was a very strange few moments. I still do not know what to make of it.

Over the next half hour or so there were a number of questions, and I was interviewed at length by a reporter for the *Daily Titan*, the young Muslim lady whose story was published the following Monday, 10 May. I will quote from her story further on.

This talk at CSU Fullerton was not an event that occurred out of the blue. It's difficult to make clear how much time and trench work is involved in creating even a small revisionist event in the real world. In February/March we had created a big story at U Wisconsin at Madison with the placement of a seven-word ad in the online edition of the Badger Herald. The story had reached all the way up the Holocaust marketing food chain to the director of the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum. It was only natural to want to repeat this kind of outreach in the online editions of other student newspapers. The process was simpler than submitting ads to the print editions. What we were to learn is that while it was easier for us to reach the papers online, it was easier for those dedicated to censoring revisionist arguments, particularly the ADL and Hillel, to reach student newspapers as well.

It's difficult to make clear how much work, plain ole trench work, there is in pulling off one story, either online or on the ground. During April and early May alone we had a back and forth with 21 (twenty-one!) student newspapers which at first expressed interest in running one or another CODOH ad. Then, when they understood what we were talking about, they also understood they did not want to face the heat. They backed out. Tracking the back and forth with some two dozen advertising desks via telephone and email, in a small office like this one, is very time consuming.

And then there were the papers that accepted one of our ads, only to pull it because of complaints from the usual perps. As you go through the calendar below, keep in mind that at the same time we were dealing with more than twenty other desks not mentioned here.

31 March: We were running a banner ad in the online edition of the *Volante* at U of South Dakota that read:

"The Gas chambers of Sherlock Holmes by Samuel Crowell. The full text of the book is ***here***".

The reader could click on the link and would have *Sherlock* there

before her, a unique and beautifully written book. This ad was to run the month of April. The editor of *Volante* pulled the ad after the second week. Hernandez was not able to reach either the ad manager or the Editor in Chief.

05 April: The online edition of the *Daily Titan* at Cal State Fullerton accepted our banner ad that read "The Irrational Vocabulary of the American Professorial class…" When the reader clicked on the ad she was taken to the Founder's Page on CODOH.com which features the full text of the talk I gave at the Holocaust conference in Tehran in December 2006. This ad would rotate all over the *Titan's* online site. It was to run 30 days.

07 April: The *Synapse* at U California-San Francisco accepted a text link for its online edition of the paper where the link read: "The Irrational Vocabulary of the American Professorial Class with regard to the Holocaust …" It ran in the opinion section of the newspaper. It was to run for 60 days, through the end of May. The second week in April the managing editor of the *Synapse* emailed Hernandez:

"The link you purchased recently on the Synapse web site came to my attention yesterday. I have had the link pulled off our site, because it violates Synapse advertising policy, which states Synapse and its editorial board reserve the right to decline advertising promoting false or misleading claims, known health risks, or content deemed by the editors to be antithetical to the interests of UCSF students or the UCSF community. Since your ad violates that policy in several particulars, we should never have accepted it in the first place. You will not be charged for the time your link was on our website.

"We do not wish to hear from you ever again.

"Tim Neagle, Managing Editor, Synapse."

Hernandez called and emailed the *Synapse* to find out which of the *Synapse* policies the ad violated but could get no answer.

14 April: The *Chicago Maroon* at the University of Chicago began a run of our ad titled "The Irrational Vocabulary of the American Professorial Class with Regard to…" It was a small variation of the ad that was running in the *Daily Titan*. It ran in the *Maroon* on 14 and 15 March, and on the 16th we received an email from the ad manager that read:

"Hey Roberto: Your banner ad only appeared once. When we clicked on the sentence it directs you to information about the Holocaust. The *Chicago Maroon* can't accept advertising that has any reference or opinions concerning the Holocaust. Thanks, Judy"

No "opinions" then permitted about the big H. No opinions by whom?

21 April: The *Daily Titan* ran an editorial explaining why it had pulled our ad. It was pulled because the *Titan* felt it had a "moral obligation" to its readers to do so.

22 April: I submitted a letter to the editor of the *Titan* pointing out some errors of fact in their editorial, and questioning their perspective on moral obligation versus a free exchange of ideas. I thought the letter, if it were to be published at all, would appear the following Monday, April 26.

23 April: The *Minnesota Daily*, U of Minneapolis St. Paul, agreed to run our ad as a link in a rectangular block that in five lines would read: "Why is it Taboo? Is it a thought crime? Why? I spoke in Tehran. Here is what I said. Decide for yourself." The *Daily* surprised us and formatted the ad beautifully. In this instance the ad was handled by a senior marketing consultant for the *Daily*. We felt certain that it would run. The next day we got an email from the young man.

"Roberto. Given the nature of Smith's website and its borderline content, it was the decision of the Minnesota Daily to take the advertisement down. When originally posting the online advertisement I was unaware of the potentially offending messages Mr. Smith's website advocates, and we do not feel it is in the best interest of the Minnesota Daily to condone such advertisements. In light of this, the Minnesota Daily will be refunding Mr. Smith's credit card the full amount paid for the advertisement and we do apologize for any confusion or inconvenient.

"Brian J. Bruggeman
"Senior Marketing Consultant
"The Minnesota Daily"

26 April: My letter to the editor of the *Daily Titan* had not yet been published. We had some kind of story there and it was going to disappear. I think it was the next day here in the office when it came to me that we should just do it. We should go to CSU Fullerton, give a talk and tape it. It had to happen quick. The semester was ending. Exams were already in progress. Hernandez got on it.

30 April: The negotiations with CSU-Fullerton were signed, sealed, and delivered via email and fax. I

would speak on campus on 06 May.

03 May: When we already understood that we were going to be at CSU-Fullerton on the afternoon of the 6th, we found that the *Daily Titan* had published my letter to the editor. Together with a long letter using what appears to be a daughter-of-survivors vocabulary or that of a Hillel functionary. This time, after repeated phone calls, Hernandez was able to interview the *Titan* editor, Sergio Cabaruvias. Cabaruvias was not particularly communicative, but he did mention that the faculty advisor for the *Titan* was part of the discussions that led to the ad being pulled, and that they were concerned that what happened at U Wisconsin-Madison when the *Badger Herald* had run one of our ads might happen at CSU-Fullerton. No one connected with the *Daily Titan* wanted that to happen.

When I had first asked Hernandez to set up the talk at Fullerton it was in my mind to use the talk I had given at the Tehran Holocaust conference in 2006. It was titled "The Irrational Vocabulary of the American Professorial Class with Regard to the Holocaust Question." That is a primary message I want to get over to students and the press generally. That academics as a class use an irrational vocabulary when they treat with the Holocaust question. That talk was done, it was good, and it would work for a new audience. On Monday, 03 May, as I went over the text, I realized I was mistaken. I had to prepare a talk specifically for Fullerton.

The Friday before, when I was signing and faxing papers to the Titan Student Union, I'd had to provide a title for the talk. It was part of the contract. We decided on "The Student Newspaper and the Question of Taboo." Okay. Now I had to work out a talk that was relevant to and focused on that title.

Saturday and Sunday, 01 and 02 May, I was occupied with family matters. There's work, and then there's family work. On Monday I was busy with office work. I wasn't worried. The talk would write itself. I wasn't giving a lecture at Harvard to the Alan Dershowitzes.

On Tuesday, 04 May, I had to get started. I didn't have to write much, but I found I had structural issues with what I had been planning to do. I had too much information. It wasn't organized right. For some reason I found it difficult going. I was surprised. I worked all day into the evening before getting a sense that I was on the right track.

Wednesday morning it was all sorted out in the brain, at last. I put together the whole enchilada on Wednesday, 05 May. I finished at five in the afternoon. At 6pm we were scheduled to begin our drive north. We had to get across the border to Chula Vista before the stores closed. We needed extra memory for the little camera, extra batteries. We would then continue on to Fullerton, another hour or so drive, stay the night, and be ready for the next day at 2pm.

I chose to not advertise the time and place of the talk in the *Daily Titan*. That would appear odd, but to do so might put the affair in jeopardy. The wrong people, all the heavyweights on or near the campus would besiege the Titan Student Union threatening, cajoling, doing what they could to see that the event was cancelled. Rather, on 05 May, Wedensday, the day before the talk was to take place and I was still here working on the text, Hernandez sent an alert to student organizations on the campus, the staff of the *Titan*, and the local press. We could get an audience of fifty, or one of five. No way to know. But the important thing was to be there and to have *Titan* staff there. Maybe the paper would report something that I actually said.

06 May: We got to the campus at 1pm, used half an hour to find and figure out how to park the car, then walked over to the Titan Student Union (TSU). It took me a while to find a copy of that day's issue of the *Titan*. When I found the paper I discovered that I shared the front page with Arnold Schwarzenegger. Arnold was swearing that he would increase funding for education. The headline for the other front-page story read: "Holocaust to be Questioned at TSU Today." Arnold and me. I could go with that. The headline was not quite accurate, but sharing the front page with Arnold was a pick-me-up.

When I found the meeting room where I was to speak, Hernandez was there setting up the camera and there were a handful of people waiting. During the talk students and professors would continue to arrive and depart, maybe 40 in all, a modest audience but one that under the circumstances I was satisfied with

And then that was it. I gave the talk that you find on the front page of this issue of *SR*. I fumbled around here and there, but it went all right. There were three things that I found unusual. One, during the talk itself the audience was quiet and appeared to be interested. Two: they were willing to laugh when I made a wisecrack. And three—and this is the one I still do not understand—when I finished the talk I said "Thank You," and I asked for questions.

After the very long several moments of silence and immobility that I described above, the audience began to stand up and move out, some nodding to me as they left, or saying a simple good-bye, and a couple stopped at the podium to ask questions. One was a very polite Jewish student. One was a reporter from the *Titan*. She turned out to be from India, but a Muslim. She interviewed me carefully. After the event Hernandez told me she was wearing a recording device on her wrist.

10 May: The *Daily Titan* published an article headlined "Holocaust Revisionist speaks at the Titan Student Union" It was written by Zam Anwar, the young Indian-Muslim lady who had interviewed me after my talk. It is the most objective, fair-minded and accurate news story to ever be printed about me in the American press. Perhaps about any revisionist. There are 32,000 students at CSUF, and a couple thousand academics. Here are a few passages from Ms. Anwar's article.

The purpose of Smith's appearance was to argue that the American professorial class, allied with special interest organizations, supports a taboo over the free exchange of ideas regarding the Holocaust question, and that student journalists who do not cooperate put their careers at risk.

Smith said: "It is my guess that there is not one professor at CSU Fullerton who would stand up in public to defend any journalist or the newspaper itself if they proceeded to publish anything that questioned the orthodox Holocaust story."

"If you do not like the message on the American campus with regard to this subject, you bury it, you snuff it out, you suppress it, you censor it, you kill it and do all you can to destroy the messenger. That's how it works."

"If facts (of the Holocaust) have been established, then there should be no risks associated with students asking questions about the Holocaust," Smith said.

"It is my view that it is right and good to question authority," Smith said. "And to question vigorously, precisely those matters that authority tells you are unquestionable."

Summing up, Smith claimed that the American professorial class exploits an irrational vocabulary to respond to revisionist's arguments questioning the orthodox Holocaust story. "The decision of the American professorial class to exploit this irrational vocabulary is a deliberate decision to avoid communication with peers, students and campus newspapers," Smith said.

"I'm willing to be convinced that I'm wrong about any of this, but for some reason, I'm not willing to be convinced that I should shut up," Smith said.

Rabbi Drew Kaplan, who serves for Hillel, was at the event after a student informed him about the speaker. Kaplan said that the Holocaust is a huge part of the Jewish story and to hear someone talk about it in such a way was disturbing.

"At least he didn't say he was denying the Holocaust, he said he was revising it. But even though he didn't deny the Holocaust, it's bizarre that he denies the gas chambers in spite of all the evidence for them," said Kaplan, adding that it is still disturbing to the Jewish psyche because the Holocaust was not only bad in the numbers of people who were systematically murdered but also in terms of the destruction of European Jewish culture.

"It remains in the Jewish memory," Kaplan said.

Grant Deering, chair of the TSU governing board, said that most people at the talk expected a 'crazy' guy, but Smith actually stuck to the topic that he said he would.

It's so simple, really. You just report what the revisionist actually says, and let the reader do what she will with it. It's an idea that has been beyond the grasp of the American professorial class, beyond the grasp of chancellors of American universities, and beyond the reach of journalists in the American press for more than half a century now. Except for one young Muslim reporter and her Hispanic editor at the *Daily Titan.*

Is it possible that there is an idea embedded in this turn of events that can be expanded on?

10 May: The same day that the *Daily Titan* published the above article, the University of Delaware *Review* accepted a CODOH banner ad titled "Ignore the Thought Police, Read the Evidence, Judge for Yourself." This ad led to Introductory Essays on CODOH.com.

11 May: *The Review* pulled the above banner ad.

13 May: *The Eastern Echo* at Eastern Michigan University in Ypsilanti began to run a text link that reads: "Speaking to Muslims." Clicking on the link the reader is taken to the talk I gave in Tehran in 2006.

YOUTUBE VIDEOS

The day after the Fullerton talk, back here in Baja, we set about making YouTube videos using segments of the talk. We did not have the right equipment at Fullerton but we did okay. I will have to invest in a good camera and some lighting if I am going to give this talk again on other campuses. It'll cost somewhere around $1,000 to $1,200.

Our YouTube videos online have been viewed more than 17,000 times.

THE BRADLEY SMITH HERESY AND BEYOND

The lead article in the last issue of *SR* by Michael K. Smith occasioned a number of impassioned negative responses from readers. The core reactions focused on his "revisionist" ideas about the communist experiment in the Soviet Union and China. For my own part, M.K. Smith made me aware that while I have referred to the monstrous crimes of those two communist states, in reality I know (know) little about the matter and am repeating charges made by others. While I remain a "true believer" in the monstrous nature of these two regimes, I had meant to discuss what is, nevertheless, the carelessness of some of my own vocabulary with regard to these matters here in *Smith's Report*. But as you see, I won't get around to it this month.

NOAM CHOMSKY, AGAIN.

On 16 May Noam Chomsky, the famed MIT linguist and radical political writer was denied entry into Israel where he was to speak to Palestinian students at Bir Zeit University on the West Bank. He was banned for having expressed opinions about history and American/Israeli policies that the Israeli government does not approve. Among his statements regarding history are those he made in the 1970/80s. Chomsky has said publicly, and never recanted:

"I see no anti-Semitic implications in denial of the existence of gas chambers, or even denial of the holocaust. Nor would there be anti-Semitic implications, per se, in the claim that the holocaust (whether one believes it took place or not) is being exploited, viciously so, by apologists for Israeli repression and violence."

"I objected to the founding of Israel as a Jewish state. I don't think a Jewish or Christian or Islamic state is a proper concept. I would object to the United States as a Christian state."

"The Hebrew press is much more open than the English language press, and there's a very obvious reason: Hebrew is a secret language, you only read it if you're inside the tribe."

"Of course [suicide bombers are] terrorists and there's been Palestinian terrorism all the way through. I have always opposed it….But it's very small as compared with the US-backed Israeli terrorism."

He told *Le Monde* on January 19, 1981, that he was "agnostic" about the Nazi massacres. He did not want people "to have religious or dogmatic positions about the existence of the Holocaust."

Reflecting on these matters, I am aware that I am taking Noam Chomsky's own message to the American campus. Am I in good company or what?

A final thought. Uncertain that he would be able to address his Palestinian audience in person, Chomsky gave his talk from Amman using a video feed. The audience in Bir Zeit U amounted to about 100 persons. It was not the size of the audience then, but the significance of the situation that mattered. That took the story into headlines around the world.

This is what I can do, with your continued support. I can continue to take the "Chomsky/Smith" (forgive me, Noam) message on the Holocaust question into the American university campus and thus to the world. Without you, it won't happen. There is no one else.

Bradley

Smith's Report
is published by
Committee for Open Debate on the Holocaust

Bradley R. Smith, Founder

For your contribution of $39 you will receive 12 issues of *Smith's Report*.
Canada and Mexico--$45
Overseas--$49

Letters and Donations to:
Bradley R. Smith
Post Office Box 439016
San Ysidro, CA 92143

Desk: 209 682 5327
Email:
bradley1930@yahoo.com